

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3028/307006.01
Application No.: 10/776,371
Office Action Dated: February 8, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, dated February 28, 2007, claims 1-42 are pending with claims 1, 15 and 29 being the independent claims. Claims 1-42 currently stand rejected. The applicants would like to thank the examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on June 4, 2007. The contents of this interview are addressed in the relevant sections below.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. During the interview, the examiner agreed that with entry of the above amendments, claim 1 now recites concrete steps that overcome this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rosenberg (“Bringing Java To The Enterprise: Oracle On Its Java Server Strategy”). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36 are patentable for the reasons set forth below.

As amended, claim 1 now recites:

A method for coordinating the operation of a database management system and a common language runtime executing on a common server, said method comprising:

receiving a request from the common language runtime for at least one system resource via an application programming interface of the database management system;

interpreting said request to determine at least one action to be performed;

transmitting a request to the server via the database management system when said at least one action requires communication with the common server; and

returning a response to the common language runtime via
said application programming interface of the database
management system.

As discussed in the interview, Rosenberg discusses various aspects of the Oracle Java product strategy. In particular, the passages cited by the examiner described Oracle's Java server technology and various methods for concurrent operation of a Java Virtual Machine and the Oracle server. However, the passages do not disclose or suggest receiving a request from the common language runtime for at least one system resource via an application programming interface of the database management system; interpreting said request to determine at least one action to be performed; transmitting a request to the server via the database management system when said at least one action requires communication with the common server; and returning a response to the common language runtime via said application programming interface of the database management system

as now recited in the claim.

Independent claims 15 and 29 recite similar features to those described with respect to claim 1. Based on the foregoing, claims 1, 15, and 29, along with their dependent claims, are patentable for the reasons set forth above. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 15, 16, 18-20, 22, 29, 30, 32-34, and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 17, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Bugnion (U.S. Patent No. 6,944,699). Claims 7, 21, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Lucovsky (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,207). Claims 9, 10, 23, 24, 37, and 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Kumar (U.S. Patent No. 6,697,810). Claims 11-14, 25-28, and 39-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Ng (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0225893).

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-3028/307006.01
Application No.: 10/776,371
Office Action Dated: February 8, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

Claims 3, 7, 9-14, 17, 21, 23-28, 31, 35, and 37-42 are variously dependent on the independent claims described above, and are therefore patentable for those reasons set forth above.

For at least the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 7, 9-14, 17, 21, 23-28, 31, 35, and 37-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested. Applicants submit that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Date: July 9, 2007

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439